



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

<CAPITALIZE>

Respondent Name

TPS JOINT SELF INS FUNDS

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-04-0639-01

DWC Claim #:

Injured Employee:

Date of Injury:

Employer Name:

Insurance Carrier #:

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

11

MFDR Date Received

SEPTEMBER 11, 2003

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary Dated May 2, 2003: "It has come to our attention that this bill has been audited incorrectly. This bill qualifies as a **STOP LOSS** bill per rule 134.401. If audited charges exceed \$40,000.00, carrier should reimburse 75% of total charges (**134.401 C(6)**). Per **Stop Loss rule, this method is to be used in place of and not in addition to per diem/Fair and Reasonable** or any other method of audit. In addition, the **only items allowable** by TWCC for the carrier to deduct are patient convenience items and non – compensable area treatment. It should also be noted that implant **invoices are not required** by TWCC to be included in submission of a complete medical bill. Invoices are required when their individual reimbursement should be considered. In a stop loss bill this is not a consideration and invoices are therefore not required."

Amount in Dispute: \$18,292.85

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary Dated September 22, 2003: The Carrier responded to the DWC-60 response on September 22, 2003 however a position statement was not provided.

Response Submitted by: Harris & Harris Attorney At Law

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated October 30, 2003: "... A review of the documentation indicates the Provider-Requestor seeks additional reimbursement for in-patient surgical services delivered to the Claimant between November 12, 2002, and November 16, 2002. The Requestor billed \$76,931.03 for these services. The Respondent Carrier audited the bill and reduced it to \$39,344.29. The amount in dispute is \$18,292.85 ... Moreover, the Provider's charges must comply with the statutory requirement set forth in Texas Labor Code Section 413.011 (d), which mandates that "Guidelines for medical services fees must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The Requestor has, to date, refused to explain how it arrived at the billed amount. The Requestor has failed to demonstrate that it billed its usual and customary charges for this stay..."

Response Submitted by: Harris & Harris Attorney at Law

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
November 11, 2002 through November 16, 2002	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$18,292.85	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to requests filed on or after January 1, 2003, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 33 *Texas Register* 3954, applicable to requests filed on or after May 25, 2008, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

- Explanation of benefits were not provided

Issues

1. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
2. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 *Texas Register* 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 *South Western Reporter Third* 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services." Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection..." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states "...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed..." The division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.

2. The requestor in its position statement asserts that "It has come to our attention that this bill has been audited incorrectly. This bill qualifies as a **STOP LOSS** bill per rule 134.401. If audited charges exceed \$40,000.00, carrier should reimburse 75% of total charges (**134.401 C(6)**). ". As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals in its November 13, 2008 rendered judgment to the contrary. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved...unusually extensive services." The requestor failed to discuss or demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitute unusually extensive services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor did not meet 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6).
3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the requestor in its position statement does not address unusually costly. The third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must **demonstrate** that an admission involved unusually costly services thereby affirming 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) which states that "Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker." The requestor failed to discuss or demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitute unusually costly services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor failed to meet 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6).
4. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.
 - Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that "The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission..." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the length of stay for this admission was three surgical days and one ICU/CCU; therefore the standard per diem amounts of \$1,118.00 and \$1,560.00 apply respectively. The per diem rates multiplied by the allowable days result in a total allowable amount of \$4,914.00.
 - Review of the medical documentation provided finds that although the requestor billed items under revenue code 278, no invoices were found to support the cost of the implantables billed. For that reason, no additional reimbursement is recommended.

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$4,914.00. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$39,344.29. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to discuss and demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive, and unusually costly services. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

Authorized Signature

Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

11/9/12
Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.**
Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.